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# Executive Summary

## Background

The Veterans Information System Technology Architecture (VistA) is the Congressionally-approved, authoritative, comprehensive, longitudinal veteran health information system of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). For the past thirty-five years, 131 VistA systems have provided all clinical, financial, and administrative functions to support all clinical and administrative operations of over 1200 VA hospitals and clinics throughout the United States. Each VistA system is comprised of over 180 clinical, administrative, and financial applications integrated within a single database, with many of these applications specific to VA care and benefits, and government compliance and reporting.

The VistA Standardization and Virtualization (VSV) project – the parent project to this Performance Work Statement (PWS) -- is intended to move all possible VistA instances that have been modified at the local facility level to a single, enterprise-deployable, standard software image. The VSV project will benefit Veterans, Clinicians and OI&T staff by achieving commonality across multiple versions of VistA, supporting over 1,600 points of care.

This VistA Adaptive Maintenance project - under the parent VSV project – is intended to progress and further this transformation by modifying select components of VistA to facilitate continued usability in a changed or changing environment. The goal of the VistA Adaptive Maintenance project is to provide backwards and forwards compatibility for selected VistA components and use cases such that VistA’s Graphical User Interface (GUI), the Computerized Patient Retrieval System (CPRS), business functionality is isolated and emulated via a service layer to enable retrieval by CPRS and accessibility to those components via web-friendly interfacing by new clients.

## Evaluation committee

The evaluation committee was comprised of.the Project Manager, Dr. Rafael Richards.

## evaluation methodology

The team established a pass/fail set of criteria (see section 3 for results). Based upon the information provided, an overall determination as to whether a particular company could successfully perform the work was determined based on the initial pass/fail criteria. The respondents evaluated were:

**T4NG**

* Systems Made Simple/Leidos (SMS)
* AbleVets, LLC (AbleVets)
* Liberty IT Solutions, LLC

# Evaluation Summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SMS** | **AbleVets** | **Liberty** |
| **SDVOSB/VOSB/Small** | No | Yes | Yes |
| **Overall Capable** |  |  |  |
| **5.1 Project Management** |  |  |  |
| **5.2. Sustainment Services** |  |  |  |
| **5.3 Planning** |  |  |  |
| **5.4 Build and Development** |  |  |  |
| **5.5 IOC Support** |  |  |  |
| **5.6 Release and Deployment Support** |  |  |  |
| **5.7 Transition Support** |  |  |  |

# RFI RELATED QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATIONS / SUBMISSION

Questions provided separately

1. **Conclusions and recommendations**

**T4NG**

* SMS –
* AbleVets – AbleVets, candidly, did not provide a technical approach to any of the PWS requirements. Their RFI response focused solely on its resourcing and past performance, of which its past performance indicated many related and relevant projects which have required significant technical depth and understanding at the metadata level and service level. Although it would have been a significant plus to have a preliminary indication of its approach to this TO, which was not provided, we do believe that based on the specific past Performance referenced that AbleVets does demonstrate sufficient capabilities to meet the requirement.
* Liberty – Liberty’s technical approach focused solely on its Agile methodology. They did not in any way address the particulars of PWS 5.2 where the specific and complex functions of service layer and RPC refactoring require deep VistA expertise and functional knowledge of the referenced domains. Rather, their approach to this section and referenced experience was topical relative to performing maintenance where bug fix – whether proactive or reactive - is the primary service. There was no specific reference to indicate technical domain depth for 5.2.1 or 5.2.2, nor any approach indicated to demonstrating the capability to support the re-development of the service layer in the required format. As a result, we believe that Liberty did not demonstrate sufficient capabilities to meet the requirement.